

# Colusa Subreach Planning Project Advisory Workgroup

## Draft Meeting Summary

### May 2, 2005 – Colusa County Farm Bureau

**Summary prepared by Carolyn Penny, Facilitator, Common Ground: Center for Cooperative Solutions with assistance from Ellen Gentry, Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum**

**Present:**

AW: Annalena Bronson, Burt Bundy, Denny Bungarz, Ben Carter, Gary Evans, Michael Fehling, Rebecca Fris, John Garner, Pat Kittle, Ray Krause, Kelly Moroney, Dan Obermeyer, Jeff Sutton, Jon Wrysinski, and Dawit Zeleke.

Alternates: Joan Phillipe (Alternate for John Rogers).

Staff: Beverly Anderson-Abbs (SRCAF), Michelle Baker (Common Ground), Ellen Gentry (SRCAF), Facilitator Carolyn Penny (Common Ground), Project Manager Gregg Werner (TNC)

**Agenda as Proposed:**

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Approximate Start Time</u>	<u>Lead Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
1.	5:00	Carolyn Penny, Facilitator	Welcome, Introductions, April Meeting Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions. Approve agenda. Approve April summary.</li> </ul>
2.	5:10	Gregg Werner, All	Review of CSP budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared understanding of CSP budget amounts and status.</li> </ul>
3.	5:30	Gregg Werner, All	AW-Identified Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review descriptions and budget ranges for priority areas.</li> <li>• Refine list of priorities.</li> </ul>
4.	6:15	Public	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receive comment.</li> </ul>
5.	6:30	All	Dinner and Break	
6.	7:00	All	AW-Identified Studies, Continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine process and timeline for development of projects.</li> </ul>
7.	8:00	Gregg Werner, All	Subreach Background Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resolve subreach background report composition.</li> <li>• Determine information to be added to the draft report.</li> </ul>

## Colusa Subreach Planning Project Advisory Workgroup Draft Meeting Summary 5.2.05

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Approximate Start Time</u>	<u>Lead Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
8.	8:15	Gregg Werner, All	Initial Landowner Survey Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Distribute initial landowner survey report.</li><li>• Determine plan for further discussion after review.</li></ul>
9.	8:30	All	Review summer meeting schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discuss summer meeting logistics and expectations.</li><li>• Discuss possible workshop.</li></ul>
10.	8:45	Carolyn Penny, All	Next Agenda and Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Shape next agenda; articulate interim steps.</li></ul>
11.	9:00	Carolyn Penny	Adjourn	

### Review of April Meeting Notes

The meeting began at 5:10 PM with a welcome by Carolyn Penny, Facilitator for the Advisory Workgroup (AW), and self introductions of all participants.

Jeff suggested a change to the April meeting notes on page 6, Review of AW Ground Rules, to reflect that the AW would “recommend” not “authorize”. Dawit agreed. Carolyn will amend the notes to reflect that change and send them to Ellen for distribution. With that change, the AW agreed to the April meeting summary as final.

Rebecca’s revisions to the March Meeting notes will be given to Carolyn. Carolyn will amend the notes to reflect the changes regarding description of Rebecca’s comments and send the amended notes to Ellen for distribution. With that change, the AW agreed to the March meeting summary as final.

### Review of CSP Budget

Gregg presented the 2005 first quarter Planting Budget – CBDA Recipient Agreement ERP-02-P27, involving total funds over a three year period. It was requested that a more detailed accounting would be of importance to some members of the group. In particular, some AW members are interested in all the figures, including salaries, that add up to the totals for each task so they can answer questions from their constituents. Ben expressed surprise at the proportion for contract management. Annalena responded that the amounts for contract management seemed reasonable to her. Gregg will provide the more detailed budget information for the June meeting.

### **AW-Identified Studies**

Gregg provided the Cost Estimate Summary for CSP Modeling, Planning and Research Projects for review. Task 3 Modeling, Task 4 Focal Area Planning and Task 5 Landowner Questions were discussed regarding funding available, identified projects, and estimated cost ranges. Gregg noted that some reallocation of funding among these tasks is possible depending on AW preferences.

#### *Potential Study #1: Hydraulic Modeling*

Potential Study #1 connects to modeling already conducted by Ayres Associates. Ayres Associates has modeled approximately ½ of the area already. This study would cover the other half. Gregg and Greg Golet clarified that the Ayres Associates approach includes 2-dimensional flow modeling which is calibrated against real flows and includes updated land uses. Greg Golet explained that the consultants can input projected restoration changes by adjusting friction coefficients.

Members of the AW expressed concern that silt and large woody debris (LWD) may have already reduced capacity. Other AW members noted that LWD is a separate project and that, under that separate project, it would be nice to have Department of Water Resources pull historical information. Several AW members noted that the LWD study and Hydraulic Analysis are separate studies and interrelated.

The AW discussed peer review to clarify what it looks like. Gregg answered that it would involve another hydraulic engineer with local credibility to review the scope of work and results. He noted that he had already checked with Ayres and they will have no discomfort with someone looking over their shoulder.

Annalena noted that the date for the Murray, Burns, and Kienlen report on page 1 of the Landowner Concern Project Information Sheet should be changed from “1987” to “1978.” Other AW members expressed admiration that someone would know the reports in such detail.

#### *Potential Study #2 – Public Access and Recreation*

Members of the AW requested clarification from Rebecca on whether there were limitations in using the Calfed funding to conduct planning studies regarding recreation. She mentioned that there were no limitations regarding planning with these funds; implementation of a recreation plan will require certain funds where the use is allowed. The AW considered forming a subcommittee and/or holding a meeting for public input in regard to this study. Both possibilities will be considered as the AW moves forward. Pat Kittle noted that other recreational groups may be willing to invest for this study as well.

#### *Potential Study #3 – Ward Property Recreation/Restoration Plan*

Mike noted that this study would be a significant first step and would likely move the property ahead on the schedule for implementing a plan. The AW will consider forming a subcommittee for this study as well if it is selected. Members of the AW noted that this plan represents a potential win for local constituents.

*Potential Study #4 – Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB) Incidental Take Agreement*

Members of the AW raised the question on whether this study duplicates current work. The group noted that it would want a question and answer session with Robert LaFleur, the US Fish and Wildlife Service ESA Coordinator, if they move ahead. Annalena said this one piece on this one project would be a huge step forward for future efforts. Kelly added the Feather River effort is in the works now.

Members of the AW would like to see the garter snake habitat included in any incidental take agreement. Other AW members raised the question of the geographic area covered. Gregg envisions coverage for the restoration sites and a zone around them. Gary stated the possibility to mitigate countywide would be a big “attaboy” for everyone involved. Burt concurred. Jeff mentioned that this effort would be cutting-edge and desirable – and results are not a sure thing.

*Potential Study #5 – LWD Dynamics Analysis*

AW members expressed concern that the entire amount available for studies could be spent on this issue without learning anything useful. The group discussed current work by DWR in tracking the type of trees being removed as LWD from the river. The AW’s sense is that the bulk of the wood is walnut and cottonwood. AW members noted that the oaks may be sinking and trapping sediment. Ben noted that the LWD issue is important to deal with since it is important to the community. The AW agreed it would like a presentation on the current state of knowledge on LWD – and that presentation will help it refine its decision. The AW requested that Gregg return with more information on what is going on now and how it may best leverage results.

*Potential Study #6 – Hydraulic Analysis – Current Channel Capacity and Historic Data*

As with the LWD study, the AW questioned whether the information from the Channel Capacity Study would make a difference. Members of the AW raised the question why this information is not included in the hydraulic analysis or baseline assessment. The AW concluded that a presentation from an expert would be helpful in assessing the usefulness of this study.

*Potential Study #7 – Fiscal Impact on Local Agencies and Potential Study #8 – Effect on Local Economy*

Greg Golet suggested that the same contractors could be hired for both of these studies. AW members noted that these studies would provide information but not change the situation. Jeff noted that past studies along these lines generated much criticism when highly subjective factors were given monetary values. The AW agreed that it is hard to identify the contributing factors for these analyses and that results are often influenced by subjective judgments. Jeff suggested that Study #8, if conducted, needs to focus on hard, not fuzzy, numbers.

After several minutes of discussion on the complexity of these sorts of studies, members of the AW expressed that they would like to keep the focus on the local economy and make the studies very transparent with all assumptions clearly stated. Dan mentioned that it will be important to keep funding sources separate and clear in the analysis since property tax revenue, for example, is distributed differently than sales tax revenue. Jeff agreed.

*Potential Study #9 – Identify Endangered Species Act (ESA) and Regulatory Limitations and Ways to Reduce*

Several members of the AW mentioned a desire to look at species beyond the VELB. Other members mentioned that the species in question are already listed in the subreach report. Greg Golet stated that what's missing is the compiled assessment of the restrictions. AW members expressed concern for further definition of the deliverable for this study. Ben noted that the central question is the impacts on surrounding agriculture if habitat is adjacent and a protected species migrates.

*Potential Study #10 – Pest Effect on Agricultural Lands Related to Habitat Restoration*

The AW discussed the deliverable with this study. Gregg noted that the effort would be two-fold – to identify the types and degrees of depredation impacts and to identify the ways to minimize those impacts. Burt mentioned that the Technical Advisory Committee to the SRCAF is looking at cross-boundary issues and may be of help with this issue. Beverley reviews projects in the TAC and has started reviewing adjacent landowners on what worked and what didn't, going to the agency for possible solutions. Ben mentioned that it is essential to the good neighbor policy to know third-party impacts and put measures in place to address them. Dawit noted that TNC efforts have been very successful with some neighboring agricultural lands and that much has been learned from those experiences. Greg Golet noted the focus will look at rodents, deer, insects, and identifying actions to limit or reduce depredation. He noted some work has been done already regarding pest species. The level of interaction is the biggest determinant of the cost range. Members of the AW noted it would be helpful to have a model policy for addressing impacts after the restoration is completed.

*Overall Reflections*

Members of the AW made the following overall comments:

- All of projects are important; public wants answers.
- \$445k + \$100k + 85k = \$630k High Range.
- Could do low range but without much input.
- Must have tradeoffs.
- Hydraulic analysis a given.
- Limits on what can do with LWD and channel capacity – conduct studies only if get beneficial information.
- Get revised LWD estimate with limited scope.
- ESA effects and VELB PSHA – limited benefits.
- Subreach access/recreational plan – focus on Ward instead of entire subreach.
- Will know more about VELB possibilities in about 3 weeks.
- Look at outside funds for #2 and #3.
- DPR has allocated no resources for Ward yet. Likely to build on AW efforts.
- Comparative channel capacity analysis – importance is public peace of mind.

When it discussed how to move forward on the studies it identifies, the AW determined that it needed more information. For potential studies #1 (hydraulic analysis), #5 (LWD analysis), and #6 (channel capacity current and historic), Burt requested that Gregg check with Fran Borcalli or

Joe Countryman as potential speakers at the next meeting to discuss scope of work, deliverables, and the best way to get its questions answered. Ben mentioned the following priorities: public access and recreation (#2 and #3), local fiscal and economic impacts (#7 and #8), and protected or pest species impacts (#4, #9, and #10) as the areas of most focus at the public meeting. **\*were not the flood control-related items ,# 1, 5 and 6, at the top of his priority)**

### **Subreach Background Report**

The AW discussed the outline of additional materials for the 1/18/05 draft Subreach Background Report developed by discussion among Gregg and Jeff to be acceptable and workable.

### **Initial Landowner Survey Report**

The survey report was distributed and Gregg reported a 62% response. Material will be reviewed as an agenda topic two meetings out (July).

### **Interim Steps**

Burt announced the SRCAF Landowners Incentive Workshop is scheduled for July 28 and will include a landowner panel and a group of presenters to respond to landowner needs for habitat on private land. Beverly will send out information regarding this workshop to the AW.

Gregg will include the CSP budget with all items for each task with distribution of the June agenda.

Gregg will arrange for speaker(s) regarding the hydraulic/LWD/channel capacity study questions for June.

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled for June 6, from 10:00 to 2:00PM, at Colusa Farm Bureau.

Agenda Topics will be:

- Expert regarding answering flood control issues #1, #5 and #6. Best way to get questions answered – scope, budget and deliverables
- CSP Budget
- Summer meeting schedule
- Landowner survey (for July meeting if time does not allow)